

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff

v.

DANTE URELL PIGGEE,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR17-258RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO REDUCE  
SENTENCE

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Piggee's Motion for Sentencing Reduction, Dkt. #119. The Court has reviewed responsive briefing from the Government, Dkt. #120.

Mr. Piggee is in state custody. Last year, the Court revoked supervised release and imposed a 21-month custodial sentence to run consecutively to his 57-month state court sentence, with three years of supervised release. *See* Dkt. #117. He now states that his children will soon be placed in foster care and that his parental rights may be terminated. He asks the Court for "conversion of probation time owed into [electronic home monitoring] &/or quashing of the Federal hold under case # CR00258RSM-001." Dkt. #119 at 2. He cites to no rule or statute as a basis for this request.

1 It is not clear to the Court or the Government how Mr. Piggee believes he is entitled to  
2 this relief. The Government points out that he cannot seek to modify an imposed term of  
3 imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) because he is not in federal custody. Dkt. #120  
4 at 1 (citing *United States v. Fower*, 30 F.4th 823, 826–27 (9th Cir. 2022); *United States v. Tillisy*,  
5 No. CR09-269 MJP, 2022 WL 1719222, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. May 27, 2022)). The Government  
6 also argues that the Court already “considered the negative impact that Piggee’s incarceration  
7 will have on his children and their status with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families”  
8 at last year’s revocation hearing. *Id.* at 2.  
9

10 The Court understands that the termination of parental rights is a serious matter.  
11 However, Mr. Piggee’s Motion does not cite any legal authority for his requested relief. Even if  
12 such relief were available, the Government is correct that this issue was already considered by  
13 the Court and is insufficient to warrant the requested relief. Accordingly, having reviewed the  
14 Motion, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that  
15 Defendant’s Motion for Sentencing Reduction, Dkt. #119, is DENIED.  
16

17 DATED this 28<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023.

18  
19 

20 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27